

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner interprets some of the features of the reference to Fulcher et al. incorrectly. In particular, applicants submit that the following aspects are not interpreted correctly:

1. Claim 6 of the present application clearly states that the method according to the invention does not issue parking tickets. The Examiner responded by stating that the abstract of the reference to Fulcher et al. discusses a receipt and that a receipt is different form a ticket. However, it is clear from the disclosure of the reference to Fulcher et al. that this reference uses the terms receipt and ticket interchangeably. In this respect, the abstract of the reference talks about a receipt that is issued by a printer and which has a machine readable barcode. However, Fig. 10 (reference numeral 602), Fig. 11 (reference numeral 712, 714 and 718, 722), and Fig. 12 (reference numeral 814) use the term "ticket" in the same context. Also, the corresponding description, for example, column 15, lines 44-47, makes clear that a ticket is printed by the printer and has a barcode and, thus, the correct name is a "receipt". Therefore, the reference to Fulcher et al. does not in any way disclose or

suggest the feature of the present invention according to which no parking ticket is issued. Consequently, the reference does not achieve the advantages obtained by the present invention.

On page 3 of the office action, the Examiner states that the time paid for is displayed and this would indicate the amount of money not used, however, claim 6 does not state that the display "indicates" the amount of money not used, but really states that the amount of money to be paid back is displayed by the display device. Thus, a user can immediately see how much money he is going to be paid back while in Fulcher et al. the user only gets information about the time paid for and would thus need to figure out on his own how much of that time paid he has used up and which money value corresponds to the residual time. Accordingly, this is another clear advantage of the present invention as claimed over the disclosure of Fulcher et al. .

The Examiner further acknowledges that three features of claim 6 are not disclosed by Fulcher et al.. However, the Examiner takes the position that these features are obvious to the persons skilled in the art, However, the Examiner does not provide any proof.

According to claim 6 and claim 12 of the present application, the central control device sets up an individual credit account and a memory disposed in the parking meter stores the identification number as well as the value of the debited amount of money in the individual account in the memory. This feature is not disclosed in Fulcher et al . and it has the advantage that the processes of debiting and crediting can be done internally within the parking meter and the parking meter does not have to be connected to an external server in order to link up with a bank account or the like. Contrary to the position taken by the Examiner, this fact is not at all disclosed in Fig. 20, reference numeral 6.19 of Fulcher et al. Fig. 20 is a flow chart to illustrate the operation of the controlling program and reference numeral 6.19 indicates record and update data files. It is submitted that it is not clear that an individual credit account is set up and a memory is supposed to be in a parking meter.

In view of the positions taken by the Examiner, it is applicants' request that this application be discussed during a telephone interview. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request the Examiner to call the undersigned attorney as soon as this response is received.

Accordingly, applicants respectfully request the Examiner to issue a notice of allowance or, if the claims are not considered to be allowable, to set up the interview mentioned above.

In view of the differences over the art of record, applicants submit that claim 6 and the claims depending therefrom are allowable.

Respectfully submitted,

By: *FK*
Friedrich Kueffner
Reg. No. 29,482
317 Madison Avenue, Suite 910
New York, New York 10017
(212) 986-3114

Dated: May 7, 2010

MAILING CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on May 7, 2010.

By: *FK* Date: May 7, 2010
Friedrich Kueffner